and are probably conservative, since they were made prior to the North Slope oil discovery. Naturally, these figures may seem small by comparison with other states, but "important" is a relative term and a $50-million-per-year harvest of a renewable resource would be important to Alaska.

To say that our climates are unfavorable to agriculture is to forget man's history. As soon as man moved away from the food-gathering economy of the tropics into the temperate zone, he moved into an area unfavorable for agriculture because of winter seasons. He had to learn what crops would grow and how to perpetuate them from one growing season to the next. For most of our field crops in Alaska, we find that Scandinavian varieties do quite well. Rather than having unfavorable climate for our vegetables, the reverse is true. Fifty-pound cabbages are quite common in Alaska, and although useless from a commercial standpoint, they indicate the efficiency of production in this climate of long photoperiod and cool temperatures. The quality of vegetables grown under these climatic conditions far exceeds that of vegetables grown farther south.

Contrary to Lotspeich's statement, we can and do compete. The cost of potato production is fairly comparable to that in California. We do not have to spray for insects or diseases. Late blight, for instance, is unknown except near Ketchikan in the very southeastern portion of the state. Growers compete in the local market on the basis of Seattle price plus freight and net more per acre than almost any other potato growing area. In season, local lettuce completely replaces lettuce which has been shipped in. We can store and sell local lettuce over a 12-week period following the last harvest whereas stateside lettuce can be stored about 4 weeks. We have exported foundation potato seed to the other states and are presently exporting Foundation Nugget Kentucky bluegrass seed. There is no question but that we can compete.

Our problems of agricultural development are not primarily due to climate, or to lack of ability to compete, but to a host of other things, one of which is the readiness of people to accept the belief that agriculture in Alaska is impossible because it is not identical to some other area.

CHARLES E. LOGSDON
Agricultural Experiment Station,
University of Alaska,
Box AE, Palmer 99645

Crafty, Ambitious Authors

For many years *Science* has served as a forum for debate about problems in scientific communication. There is little question that we are approaching the point of being overwhelmed by scientific information. Part of our "information explosion," however, is only apparent. More and more frequently I am finding the *same* data appearing in more than one journal article. For example, I have before me three articles by the same author submitted to three different journals within an 11-month period. Each contains data from the same experiment. Article 1 contains all of the data; article 2 contains 50 percent of the data from article 1, and no more; article 3 contains 25 percent of the data included in article 1 and again, no additional data. Interestingly, the article which contained all of the data was published in *Science* and not in a speciality journal. The speciality journal article contained only 25 percent of the data. Curiously, these three articles were not even cross-referenced, which added to the appearance that each represented a unique scientific contribution.

Such multiple publication of data in primary source journals represents a "publication explosion" rather than an "information explosion." It contributes nothing to scientific progress and should cease. Many journals specifically state that the material submitted has not been and will not be submitted for publication elsewhere. If this policy were accepted and enforced by all journals, multiple publication would disappear—to our mutual benefit.

RICHARD E. WHALEN
Department of Psychobiology,
University of California,
Irvine 92664

Under the "Liberal" Umbrella

The incredible but fascinating account of the recent AAAS meeting in Boston (2 Jan., p. 36) reaffirms the fact that much of the disaffection of the "New Left" is directed against science and technology. Scientists, having accepted their guilt, are now asking themselves where they have erred, and are trying to atone for their sins. But are scientists really guilty of monstrous crimes? What is the motive of those who proclaim that science, and logical thought in general, are evil and should

be abandoned in favor of emotion? Such a question might violate the tacitly accepted rules in intellectual discussions which assume that anyone espousing a point of view labeled "liberal" does so only from a pure and noble concern for the welfare of mankind.

I suggest that in fact many of the fears currently being voiced about the evils of science represent an ignoble reaction stemming from feelings of personal inadequacy. If a person decides that he is an intellectual and should therefore be running the world by virtue of his obvious superiority, he is faced with the fact that many of the forces shaping our civilization require some understanding of the sciences. This knowledge is acquired only after some years of effort. It is easier to seek refuge in activism. Maoism is popular with a segment of the college population not because of a burning concern for social justice but because it is a doctrine which implicitly denies the need for unpleasant mental exertion. Most scientists see themselves as liberals, but unfortunately not all liberals are scientists.

The most strident critics of science will not be mollified by pledges not to participate in "war-related" research or promises to change the emphasis of certain laboratories. They object to such undertakings as the Apollo program not because they are expensive but because they directly threaten their self-esteem. . . . How is freedom of speech bolstered by permitting someone to seize a microphone and shout obscenities for 5 minutes? The opinions of the young are formed by the old, or at any rate by the older, largely through the mass media. To counteract the bad impression many people are forming of science and scientists the first step is to stop agreeing blindly with the critics. The scientific community is at fault for allowing the situation to deteriorate as far as it has. . . .

GARY W. STUPIAN
Apartment 16, 2400 Palos Verdes Drive West, Palos Verdes Estates, California 90274

Ethical Standards: In Search of a Protector

Recently, I have become aware of a dilemma for researchers in hospitals and private research institutes: there is apparently no channel through which such individuals may carry appeals or complaints resulting from violations of ethical standards by their employer institutions. This has particularly serious consequences for those who are summarily dismissed without valid grounds for dismissal. In addition, the threat of such action can be strongly repressive and preclude maximal individual thought and creative effort. By contrast, the members of the academic community receive powerful and effective support in this regard from the American Association of University Professors.

I believe that the same high standards of ethical conduct which are virtually taken for granted in the academic world should also be established and practiced by institutions outside of that community. I urge readers of *Science* who support this view to write to the Executive Officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science to request that the AAAS determine the possibility of its acting (as a counterpart to the AAUP) in behalf of individuals whose problem may be beyond AAUP jurisdiction.

E. N. BREWER
2174 Carnes Avenue, Memphis, Tennessee 38114

New Sites for Cities and Airports

On a recent flight from Newark, New Jersey, to Washington, D.C., we took off in the fog drifting in from Newark Bay, flew inland a bit and enjoyed clear air until we approached Washington, where again the mingling of cold land air and warm moist sea air produced undesirable airport conditions. Good seaports make poor airports. Most of our overpopulated cities developed because they had good seaports. But today's transportation is by air and we need airport-located cities.

Joachim Wohlwill's letter (23 Jan.) suggested population redistribution and referred to President Nixon's suggestion that new cities be built in places removed from present centers of population. Let the President appoint a city site-planning commission to encourage the growth of towns ideally situated, not only for a good supply of clean air and water, but also for good airports.

ELIZABETH A. WOOD
37 Pine Court, New Providence, New Jersey 07974